

REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1, 2, 5-26, and 29-55 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 25 and 49, which are independent, are hereby amended. It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, were in full compliance with the requirements 35 U.S.C. §112. No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which the Applicants are entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 25-49 and 51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. The independent claims have are amended herein, obviating the rejection.

III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-6, 9, 11, 12, 17, 19, 22-30, 33, 35, 36, 41, 43, 46-49 and 52-55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,983,190 to Trower, et

al.(hereinafter referred to as “Trower”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,367,454 to Kawanmoto (hereinafter, “Kawamoto”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,774,859 to Houser, et al. (hereinafter, merely “Houser”)

Claims 7, 8 and 31–32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Trower in view of Kawamoto and Houser and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,081,780 to Lumelsky (hereinafter referred to as “Lumelsky”).

Claims 10 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Trower in view of Kawamoto, and further in view of Crow et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,262,724 to Crow, et al. (hereinafter referred to as “Crow”).

Claims 13 and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Trower in view of Kawamoto, further in view of Houser, and yet further in view of U.S. Patent: 5,687,331 to Volk et al. (hereinafter merely “Volk”).

Claims 14 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Trower in view of Kawamoto, further in view of Houser, further in view of Volk, and yet further in view of Florin et al. (U.S. Patent: 5,583,560; hereinafter referred to as “Florin”).

Claims 15 and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Trower in view of Kawamoto, further in view of Houser, and yet further in view of U.S. Patent: 6,026,416 to Kanerva et al. (hereinafter merely “Kanerva”).

Claims 16 and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Trower in view of Kawamoto, further in view of Houser, further in view of Kanerva, and yet further in view of Florin.

Claims 18 and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Trower in view of Kawamoto, in further view of Houser, and yet further in view of Florin.

Claims 20 and 44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Trower in view of Kawamoto, further in view of Lumelsky, and yet further in view of U.S. Patent 5,758,079 to Ludwig et al. (hereinafter merely “Ludwig”).

Claims 21, 45, 50, and 51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Trower in view of Kawamoto, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,262,760 to Iwamura et al. (hereinafter merely “Iwamura”).

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“...wherein said output speech control means determines an assistant's speech based on a content of interaction managed by said interaction management means or an inputted user command specified by said command interpreting means, and

wherein said output speech control means determines an assistant's speech for leading a user's intention when said command interpreting means fails to specify said user's intention or said inputted user command.” (emphasis added)

As understood by the Applicants, Trower relates to a client server animation system providing services to enable clients to play animation and lip-synched speech output for an interactive user interface character.

As understood by the Applicants, Kawamoto relates to an interactive man-machine interface system that displays an animated face that exhibits human-like emotions. The system stores data representing each of eight basic emotions and continually changes the level of each basic emotion depending on environmental stimuli, internal reactions between the emotions, and the passage of time.

As understood by Applicants, Houser relates to controlling a device such as a television and for controlling access to broadcast information such as video, audio, and/or text information.

The system includes a first receiver for receiving utterances of a speaker, a second receiver for receiving vocabulary data defining a vocabulary of utterances, and a processor for executing a speech recognition algorithm using the received vocabulary data to recognize the utterances of the speaker and for controlling the device and the access to the broadcast information in accordance with the recognized utterances of the speaker.

Applicants submit that the cited portions of Houser, specifically, column 19, lines 27-60, describe that the user is prompted to repeat the command. However this has possibilities of misrecognition again because the user speaks the same word twice. Alternatively, the present invention does not prompt the user to repeat the same words, but outputs speech for leading the user's intentions.

For example, if user's commands are not specified completely, then the system outputs speech to ask back to the user based on specific information. Accordingly, even if user's intention is not specified completely, the system can confirm user's intention by outputting speech such as, "This one?", so the user just has to say "yes" or "no" without all the repeat commands.

Applicants respectfully submit that neither Trower nor Kawamoto teach or disclose the above identified feature of claim 1. Specifically, neither of the references, alone or in combination, teach nor suggest that said output speech control means determines an assistant's speech based on a content of interaction managed by said interaction management means or an inputted user command specified by said command interpreting means, and wherein said output speech control means determines an assistant's speech for leading a user's intention when said command interpreting means fails to specify said user's intention or said inputted user command, as recited in instant claim 1.

Therefore, claim 1 is patentable.

Claims 25 and 49 are similar, or somewhat similar, in scope to claim 1, and are therefore patentable for similar, or somewhat similar, reasons.

IV. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above, and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited reference, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, providing the basis for a contrary view.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicant respectfully requests early passage to issue of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By:


Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800